

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 5 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by JP 63-116904. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited reference fails to disclose all of the features defined in independent Claims 1 and 5. More specifically, Applicants respectfully submit that JP 63-116904 fails to disclose a reinforcement material having a flat coil shape where there are circular loop portions that are partly superposed on each other in sequence, with the circular loop portions terminating without making a complete circle, and wherein between adjacent circular loop portions, there is a “non-linear reformed portion with a curvature smaller than that of the circular loop portions, the non-linear reformed portion being formed by causing plastic deformation” (emphasis added), as defined in amended independent Claims 1 and 5.

Initially, Applicants appreciate the Examiner’s suggestion that the claims should be amended to exclude substantially straight reformed portions. *See* December 29, 2009 Final Office Action, page 2 (line 23) though page 3 (line 2). Accordingly, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1 and 5 to recite that the reformed portions are “non-linear.” Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 5, as amended, still read on the elected embodiment, such as the embodiment shown in Applicants’ Figure 3.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 5, as amended, are not satisfied by JP ‘904 because JP ‘904 clearly includes linear portions. Thus, JP ‘904 does not satisfy the newly added “non-linear” language of amended independent Claims 1 and 5.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §102 rejection of independent Claims 1 and 5 and associated dependent Claims 3 and 14.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over JP 63-116904 in view of United States Patent No. 3,455,100 to Sidles et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.


Claim 4 depends from independent Claim 1, and therefore includes all of the features of Claim 1, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this §103 rejection be withdrawn considering the above remarks directed to independent Claim 1, and also because the Sidles et al. reference does not remedy the deficiency discussed above, nor was it relied upon as such.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney.

If a Petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for response is required to make the attached response timely, it is hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for response in the above-identified application for the period required to make the attached response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge fees which may be required to this application under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-2069.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By 
James K. Folker
Registration No. 37,538

March 23, 2010

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080

Customer No. 24978

P:\DOCS\438617709\G39165.DOC